

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated March 14, 2006, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present Amendment amends claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-42 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39 and 40 are in independent form. Independent claims 1, 39 and 40 of the present application have been amended to more clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art.

Initially, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-42 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting in view of claims 1-158 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/809,595 to Applicant. Applicant notes that this rejection is provisional and therefore will address this matter when the conflicting claims in this co-pending application have been patented. The Examiner continues to reject the pending claims in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky.

In the present invention and system topology, a convention is conducted without client-computer-based conferencing software loaded at the client ends, such as is required by the system topology of the Salesky patent. The Salesky patent specifies a clients-in-parallel shared-display communications webcast system with conferencing software loaded on both the presenter client computer and attendee client computers. This fundamental structure of client-computer-based conferencing software specified in the Salesky patent is not comparable to Applicant's "method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client (or administrator) and at least one attendee client wherein this exchange is accomplished with a web browser computers at the client, with program instructions on a central website server" (amended language underlined) as now contained in independent claims 1, 39 and 40.

The amended claims, in terms of the specification of the present application, are directed to the program instructions 400 on a central website server 200, and evidence certain fundamental structural differences with respect to the Salesky system. As disclosed in the present application, Fig. 1 illustrates “an overall system block diagram illustrating a convention system 100 and presents a preferred embodiment of the present invention. In this embodiment, a central website server 200 is linked up over an Internet or a Web 104 to one of three separate client types implemented as standard web browser computers: an attendee client 101, a meeting planner client 102, or an exhibitor/sponsor client 103.”

Further, independent claims 1, 39 and 40 now contain such additional structural features of the present invention upon which applicant relies and thus include limitations from the specification in step a. with “receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client (or administrator), and electronically storing in convention databases at a central website server, program instruction control parameters and convention content information for a plurality of conventions”. Therefore the amended claims are directed to the innovative convention databases 300 at the central website server 200, and the program instruction 400 control parameters of the present invention. These databases and website program instructions, on a central website, are important structural differences between the claimed invention and the Salesky patent.

The terms “control parameter” or “control parameters” are employed over 20 times in the present application. These control parameters discussed in the System Structure section of the present application include: “exhibitor/sponsor client registration edit criteria control parameters; exhibitor/sponsor client booth criteria control parameters; attendee client registration edit criteria control parameters; sessions and forums processing flow control parameters; call for papers processing flow control parameters; and, cyber broadcast processing flow control parameters.” Further, this System Structure section of the present

application states: “These program instructions 400 comprise the information input, processing and output procedures including but not limited to receiving queries, control parameters and content information from any of the three client types, processing in terms of differentiating and storing the information, and releasing appropriate and formatted information.” As such, independent claims 1, 39 and 40 now contain the processing step referencing these additional structural features of the applicant’s invention upon which applicant relies, and thus include limitations from the specification in new step c. with processing the selection using the program instructions and control parameters. Finally, to assist in better referencing the central website server 200, appropriate claims have been amended from “central website” to “central website server”.

In summary, the present invention provides for the creation of a virtual convention venue where the participating attendee client can search the functional descriptive material and experience a virtual navigational experience based on the convention operational control parameters, pre-set by the meeting planner clients (or administrators) and exhibitor clients. The claims are directed to association meeting planners and tradeshow organizers (i.e., the end-users) building online tradeshows interactively by themselves. The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art.

For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39 and 40, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, none of the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as

Application No. 09/869,513
Paper Dated: June 13, 2006
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of March 14, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38, amended where appropriate with the term "server", depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Claims 41 and 42, amended where appropriate with the term "server", depend directly from independent claim 40, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-42 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By _____


Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail:webblaw@webblaw.com